

STABILITY AND BOUNDED BALLS OF FREE PRODUCTS

Azadeh Neman

January 21, 2009

1 Motivation and result

In a series of papers starting in [Sel01] and culminating in [Sel07], Z. Sela proved that free groups, and more generally torsion-free hyperbolic groups, have a stable first-order theory. The question of the stability of the free product of two arbitrary stable groups has then been raised by E. Jaligot with, seemingly, the reasonable conjecture of a positive answer [Jal08]. However, a full answer seems to become a very large project of generalization, from free groups to free products, of the above mentioned work. The first step in this process is the description of varieties, that is the understanding of Makanin-Razborov diagrams in free products. This tranfer from [Sel01] (and [Sel02, §1]) is represented in the work in progress [JS08].

In the meantime, we provide here a very preliminary — or somehow experimental — result in the direction of the stability of free products of stable groups, restricting ourselves to quantifier-free definable sets and to bounded balls of free products. Notice that we consider here a *fixed* group, and not a class of groups as in [JMN08] or [JS08].

Let $G * H$ be the free product of two groups G and H . Any element of $G * H$ has a unique representation in normal form, i.e. it is a word in letters, that is elements of G and H [LS77]. We adopt the convention that the identity element of $G * H$ is represented by the identity of G (and not of H), so that the representation is unique. The notion of length is then defined in the obvious sense for these uniquely expressed normal forms of elements of $G * H$.

For an integer $r \geq 1$, let $B_r(G * H)$ denote the ball of radius r , which is the set of elements of $G * H$ of length $\leq r$. Our experimental result is the following.

Theorem 1 *Let $G * H$ be the free product of two qf-stable groups G and H . Let $w(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be a group word and let $r \geq 1$ be a natural number. Then there exists a natural number n (depending on w and, a priori, on r) bounding the set of natural numbers m for which there exists $\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_i, \dots, \bar{a}_m$ and $\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_j, \dots, \bar{b}_m$ in $B_r(G * H)$ such that $w(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j) = 1$ if and only if $i \leq j$.*

Nonstandard notions will be defined shortly. Since we work in a fixed model, we cannot use the Infinite Ramsey Theorem just by compactness, as usual in

model theory. Hence the present proof of Theorem 1 mostly uses the Finite Ramsey Theorem (see [Wag97, Remark 0.2.7]).

Fact 2 (Finite Ramsey Theorem) *For every triple (k, n, m) of natural numbers there is some natural number $R(k, n, m)$ such that whenever unordered n -tuples of a set of size at least $R(k, n, m)$ are painted in k colors, then there is a monochromatic subset of size m .*

2 Technicalities and proofs

For the basic notions of first-order logic and model theory we refer to [Hod93]. As in [JMN08], we need versions of the combinatorial properties of [She90] not related to a complete theory.

Definition 3 *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a structure and $\phi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ a formula in the same language (possibly with parameters in the domain M of $\mathcal{M}$). Let B be a subset of M . We say that ϕ is stable relative to $(\mathcal{M}, B)$ if there exists a maximal finite m for which there exists $\bar{a}_i$ and $\bar{b}_j$ in B , $1 \leq i, j \leq m$, such that $\phi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j)$ holds in $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if $i \leq j$. The maximal such m is then called the stability index of ϕ relative to $(\mathcal{M}, B)$.*

Fact 4 *Stable formulas relative to $(\mathcal{M}, B)$ are closed under adjunction of parameters from B and under boolean combinations.*

Proof. The cases for adjunction of parameters from B and for negation are clear. Hence, for boolean combinations, it suffices to prove the case for disjunction. Notice that in the absence of compactness one cannot proceed as in [Wag97, Lemma 0.2.10].

Let $\phi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be two formulas stable relative to $(\mathcal{M}, B)$, with stability indices n_ϕ and n_ψ respectively. Let $\mu > \max\{n_\phi, n_\psi\}$. We claim that the Ramsey number $R(2, 2, \mu)$ is a bound for the stability index of $[\phi \vee \psi]$ relative to $(\mathcal{M}, B)$.

Assume towards a contradiction there exist tuples $\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_i, \dots, \bar{a}_m$ and $\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_j, \dots, \bar{b}_m$ in B , with $m > R(2, 2, \mu)$, such that $[\phi \vee \psi](\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j)$ holds if and only if $i \leq j$. Attach to each pair $\{i, j\}$ from $\{1, \dots, m\}$ a color, green if $\phi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j)$ or $\phi(\bar{a}_j, \bar{b}_i)$ holds, and red if $\psi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j)$ or $\psi(\bar{a}_j, \bar{b}_i)$ holds. Notice that, by assumption, each pair $\{i, j\}$ has a color (green, red, or both). By Fact 2, there exists a subset of $\{1, \dots, m\}$ of size at least μ and whose pairs are monochromatic. As $\phi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j)$ and $\psi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j)$ never hold for $i > j$, we get that on the new monochromatic subset $\phi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j)$ holds if and only if $i \leq j$ or $\psi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j)$ holds if and only if $i \leq j$. But this is a contradiction to the fact that $\mu > \max\{n_\phi, n_\psi\}$. $\square$

We say that a structure $\mathcal{M}$ is *qf-stable* (“quantifier-free stable”) if quantifier-free formulas are all stable relative to $(\mathcal{M}, M)$, where M is the domain of $\mathcal{M}$.

This corresponds to the usual notion of stability of $\mathcal{M}$ for quantifier-free formulas, and by Fact 4 this is equivalent to the fact that atomic formulas $\phi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ without parameters define stable sets in $\mathcal{M}$ in the usual sense. Of course, this is expressed in the universal theory of $\mathcal{M}$.

The main ingredient for the proof of Theorem 1 is the following technical lemma.

Lemma 5 *Let G and H be two qf-stable groups and let $w(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be a group word. Assume that, for some separation*

$$(1) \quad \bar{x} = (\bar{x}^G, \bar{y}^H) \text{ and } \bar{y} = (\bar{y}^G, \bar{y}^H)$$

of the variables $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$, w has the form

$$(2) \quad w(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = u_1(\bar{x}^{\epsilon_1}, \bar{y}^{\epsilon_1}) \cdots u_k(\bar{x}^{\epsilon_k}, \bar{y}^{\epsilon_k}) \cdots u_\ell(\bar{x}^{\epsilon_\ell}, \bar{y}^{\epsilon_\ell})$$

where $\ell \geq 1$ and, for $1 \leq k \leq \ell$, the ϵ_k 's represent alternatively the symbol G or H . Then there exists n (depending only on the decomposition of w as in (1) and (2)) bounding the set of natural numbers m for which there exists natural interpretations

$$\bar{a}_i = (\bar{a}_i^G, \bar{a}_i^H) \text{ and } \bar{b}_j = (\bar{b}_j^G, \bar{b}_j^H)$$

*in $G * H$ of $\bar{x} = (\bar{x}^G, \bar{y}^H)$ and $\bar{y} = (\bar{y}^G, \bar{y}^H)$ respectively, $1 \leq i, j \leq m$, such that for each i and j in $\{1, \dots, m\}$ we have:*

- $w(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j) = 1$ if and only if $i \leq j$, and
- $\bar{a}_i^G, \bar{b}_j^G \in G$ and $\bar{a}_i^H, \bar{b}_j^H \in H$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on ℓ . For $\ell = 1$ everything occurs in a same factor, G or H , and thus our claim in this case follows from the qf-stability of G and H .

Assume now one has a counterexample $w(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, with the corresponding $\ell > 1$ minimal. By inductive assumption, for each *proper* formal sub-expression from the product

$$w = u_1 \cdots u_\ell$$

there is a bound m on the existence of elements with our conditions (for this formal sub-expression). As in Fact 4, there is also such a bound when one considers the negation of such formal sub-expressions. In other words, for each proper product Πu_i from $u_1 \cdots u_\ell$, and where the factors with same exponent G or H are concatenated, we get a bound on sets of elements as in the lemma for the formulas $\Pi u_i = 1$ and $\Pi u_i \neq 1$. Let μ be a (finite) natural number bigger than the maximum of all these bounds.

We claim that the Ramsey number $R(4\ell, 2, \mu)$ has the desired property.

Otherwise, one finds $\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_i, \dots, \bar{a}_m$ and $\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_j, \dots, \bar{b}_m$, with $m > R(4\ell, 2, \mu)$, such that

$$w(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j) = 1 \text{ iff } i \leq j$$

Now colour the pairs $\{i, j\}$ from $\{1, \dots, m\}$ with 4ℓ colours describing, for each $k \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, when:

- (A) $u_k(\overline{a_i^{\epsilon_k}}, \overline{b_j^{\epsilon_k}}) = 1$ and $u_k(\overline{a_j^{\epsilon_k}}, \overline{b_i^{\epsilon_k}}) \neq 1$ for $i < j$;
- (B) $u_k(\overline{a_i^{\epsilon_k}}, \overline{b_j^{\epsilon_k}}) \neq 1$ and $u_k(\overline{a_j^{\epsilon_k}}, \overline{b_i^{\epsilon_k}}) = 1$ for $i < j$;
- (C) $u_k(\overline{a_i^{\epsilon_k}}, \overline{b_j^{\epsilon_k}}) \neq 1$ and $u_k(\overline{a_j^{\epsilon_k}}, \overline{b_i^{\epsilon_k}}) \neq 1$;
- (D) $u_k(\overline{a_i^{\epsilon_k}}, \overline{b_j^{\epsilon_k}}) = 1$ and $u_k(\overline{a_j^{\epsilon_k}}, \overline{b_i^{\epsilon_k}}) = 1$.

Notice that each pair $\{i, j\}$ is well, and uniquely, coloured in this process. By definition of $R(4\ell, 2, \mu)$ and Fact 1, there exists a monochromatic subset of $\{1, \dots, m\}$ of size at least μ .

On each “coordinate” u_k , the two first colors (A) and (B) as above are excluded. This follows from the fact that μ is larger then the stability indices of the formulas $u_k = 1$ and $u_k \neq 1$ in the group ϵ_k . This means that on each coordinate u_k the value of u_k is always 1 or different from 1 on our monochromatic subset.

We now claim that at least one coordinate u_k is constantly equal to 1 on our monochromatic subset. Otherwise, all interpretations in $G * H$ of the formal expression

$$w = \Pi_{k=1}^{\ell} u_k$$

would give rise to a normal form in the free product $G * H$, as all u_k ’s would have nontrivial interpretations alternatively in G or H (and as $\ell > 1$!). Then one would get a nontrivial value for all terms $w(\overline{a_i}, \overline{b_j})$. This is a contradiction as approximatively half of them, those for which $i > j$, are trivial.

Now one can discard the coordinates u_k ’s constantly equal to 1, and our induction hypothesis applies to the remaining *proper* subword of $w = u_1 \cdots u_{\ell}$. We then get a contradiction, as μ is larger than the stability index (in our situation) of this proper subword. $\square$

With Lemma 5 one can prove Theorem 1 as follows.

Proof of Theorem 1. Assume towards a contradiction: For each m , there exists $\overline{a}_1, \dots, \overline{a}_i, \dots, \overline{a}_m$ and $\overline{b}_1, \dots, \overline{b}_j, \dots, \overline{b}_m$ in $B_r(G * H)$ such that $w(\overline{a}_i, \overline{b}_j) = 1$ if and only if $i \leq j$. We will contradict Lemma 5 by making an appropriate “change of variables”.

Each element of $B_r(G * H)$ can be written as a product $r + 1$ of elements of G and H (alternatively). That is, each element z of $B_r(G * H)$ has the form

$$(*) \quad z = z_1^G z_2^H \cdots z_{r+1}^{G \text{ or } H}$$

with the factors in the product alternatively in G and H , as indicated by the notation in exponent. Now each variable from the tuples $\overline{x}$ and $\overline{y}$ is replaced by $r + 1$ variables as in $(*)$ (in particular we multiply by $r + 1$ the original number of variables involved in $w(\overline{x}, \overline{y})$). Clearly also, each element of $B_r(G * H)$ has a natural (though not unique) interpretation in $G * H$ with this new set of variables, as in equality $(*)$.

Now in the original group word $w(\overline{x}, \overline{y})$ we replace formally each variable by its expression with the new variables as in equality (*), and build a new corresponding word w' with these new variables as follows: when an inverse of an original variable appears one takes the visual inverse of the expression as in (*), and for products one just takes concatenation. Notice however that one does not proceed to simplifications with the new variables as one would do with elements in the group. Then we factor w' as

$$w' = u'_1 \cdots u'_\ell$$

where each subword u'_k corresponds to a maximal concatenation of the new variables or their inverse with the same exponent G or H . That is, u'_1 is the subword corresponding to the first variables with the same exponent, u'_2 is the subword consisting of the next variables with the same exponent, ...etc.

We are now in position to apply Lemma 5 with this new word w' and its decomposition $w' = u'_1 \cdots u'_\ell$ in words u'_k 's involving alternatively variables attached to G or H . Notice that one gets a contradiction to the statement of Lemma 5 with the interpretation of the $\overline{a}_i$'s and $\overline{b}_j$'s in the new variables as in equality (*).

This concludes the proof of Theorem 1. $\square$

Remark 6 *Unfortunately, the above proof of Theorem 1 highly depends on r . With w fixed, the bound n in Theorem 1 increases as r increases. We note however that r appears only in the change of variables in our proof, and in particular not via Lemma 5. Of course, a proof of the qf-stability of the free product of two (or more) qf-stable groups requires a technic which does not rely on such a fixed change of variables.*

We finish with a more general version of Theorem 1, where the number of factors is not restricted to two. Of course, the notion of length of an element and of ball in a free product have natural generalizations for free products of an arbitrary number of groups.

Theorem 7 *Let $\{G_s : 1 \leq s \leq k\}$ be a family of qf-stable groups and let $*G_s$ be their free product. Let $w(\overline{x}, \overline{y})$ be a group word and let $r \geq 1$ be a natural number. Then there exists a natural number n (depending on w and r) bounding the set of m for which there exists $\overline{a}_1, \dots, \overline{a}_i, \dots, \overline{a}_m$ and $\overline{b}_1, \dots, \overline{b}_j, \dots, \overline{b}_m$ in $B_r(*G_s)$ such that $w(\overline{a}_i, \overline{b}_j) = 1$ if and only if $i \leq j$. In particular any quantifier-free formula (possibly with parameters) is stable relative to $(*G_i, B_r(*G_i))$.*

Proof. One may proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1. For the change of variables, one now needs to decompose each element of $B_r(*G_i)$ as a product involving variables attached to each G_s . This may give an expression longer than that in equality (*) in the proof of Theorem 1, but is still possible as everything remains finite. One then gets a new word w' , decomposed as $w' = u'_1 \cdots u'_\ell$ where the new variables of each u'_k correspond alternatively to different factors.

One can then prove a similar version of Lemma 5, with possibly a separation of the variables into k blocks instead of 2, similarly by induction on ℓ .

Our last statement is just Fact 4. $\square$

References

- [Hod93] W. Hodges. *Model theory*, volume 42 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [Jal08] E. Jaligot. Groups of finite dimension in model theory. In C. Glymour, W. Wang, and D. Westerstahl, editors, *Proceedings from the 13th International Congress of Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Sciences, Beijing, august 2007*. Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, King's College Publications, London, 2008.
- [JMN08] E. Jaligot, A. Muranov, and A. Neman. Independence property and hyperbolic groups. *Bull. Symbolic Logic*, 14(1):88–98, 2008.
- [JS08] E. Jaligot and Z. Sela. Uniform Makanin-Razborov diagrams for free products of groups. In preparation, 2008.
- [LS77] R. C. Lyndon and P. E. Schupp. *Combinatorial group theory*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977. *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete*, Band 89.
- [Sel01] Z. Sela. Diophantine geometry over groups. I. Makanin-Razborov diagrams. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, (93):31–105, 2001.
- [Sel02] Z. Sela. Diophantine geometry over groups VII: The elementary theory of hyperbolic groups. preprint: <http://www.ma.huji.ac.il/~zlil/>, 2002.
- [Sel07] Z. Sela. Diophantine geometry over groups VIII: Stability. preprint: <http://www.ma.huji.ac.il/~zlil/>, 2007.
- [She90] S. Shelah. *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, second edition, 1990.
- [Wag97] F. O. Wagner. *Stable groups*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

UNIVERSITÉ LYON 1, UNIVERSITÉ DE LYON, CNRS UMR 5208 INSTITUT CAMILLE JORDAN, BÂTIMENT DU DOYEN JEAN BRACONNIER, 43, BLVD DU 11 NOVEMBRE 1918, F-69622 VILLEURBANNE CEDEX, FRANCE
 azadeh@math.univ-lyon1.fr